



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/336,031	06/18/1999	KEVIN CURTIS	2698/36	7183

26646 7590 12/02/2002

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

COLBERT, ELLA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3624	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/336,031	CURTIS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ella Colbert	3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-40 and newly added claims 41 and 42 are pending in this communication filed 06/12/02 entered as Amendment B, paper no. 6.
2. The Request for An Extension of Time filed 06/12/02 has been entered as paper no. 5.
3. The Change to Small Entity filed 06/12/02 has been entered as paper no. 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title."
5. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The new test for statutory subject matter is whether the claimed subject matter is directed to a "practical application" or "a useful, concrete and tangible result," that is, whether the claimed subject matter is applied in a practical manner to produce a useful result. "[C]ertain types of mathematical subject matter, standing alone, represent nothing more than abstract ideas until reduced to some type of practical application, i.e., 'a useful, concrete and tangible result.' " State Street, 149 F.3d 1373, 47 USPQd at 1600-01 (citing Alappat, 33 F.3d 1544, 31 USPQ2d at 1557)).

With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101, the Examiner asserts that the claimed invention does not fall within the technological arts because no form of technology is disclosed or claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 6,122,635) Burakoff et al, hereafter Burakoff.

With respect to claim 1, Burakoff teaches, processing a symbol to generate a master symbol (col. 7, lines 35-45), determining a unique parent identifier corresponding to the master symbol (col. 4, lines 15-23), storing the parent identifier and the master symbol in a master symbol database wherein the master symbol is linked to the parent identifier (col. 3, lines 29-34 and col. 4, lines 20-23), and storing at least one information element wherein the at least one information element is linked to the parent identifier (col. 4, lines 1-10 and col. 6, lines 4-14). Burakoff did not explicitly teach, a master symbol database, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a master symbol database in view of Burakoff's teachings of a ticker symbol and a database and to modify in Burakoff because such a modification would allow Burakoff's database to only store master symbols (ticker symbols) instead of storing the master symbols with the securities information and other data.

Art Unit: 3624

With respect claim 2, processing the symbol to generate the master symbol includes the step of applying a set of character rules to the symbol in col. 7, lines 41-50).

With respect to claim 3, processing the symbol to generate the master symbol includes the step of applying a set of process rules to the symbol in col. 3, lines 2-13.

With respect to claim 4, the at least one information element is a document (col. 3, lines 38-51).

With respect to claim 14, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 3.

With respect to claim 15, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 5-11, 16-22, and 30-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burakoff in view of (US 5,940,843) Zucknovich et al, hereafter Zucknovich.

With respect to claim 5, Burakoff did not teach, each master symbol is structured according to a symbol template containing at least one symbol field. Zucknovich teaches, each master symbol is structured according to a symbol template containing at least one symbol field in col. 14, lines 23-66 and col. 15, lines 1-5. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

have each master symbol structured according to a symbol template containing at least one symbol field and to combine Burakoff's processing a symbol with Zucknovich's each master symbol structured according to a symbol template containing at least one symbol field because such a modification in Burakoff would allow Burakoff to have preset templates for a user or a group of users from a particular company or geographic area and to have the template file opened for the characters to be inserted into the template. Templates are well known in the art for the purpose of being a predesigned document that contains formatting and in many cases, generic text.

With respect to claim 6, Burakoff did not teach, each master symbol includes a symbol segment corresponding to a symbol field defined by the symbol template. Zucknovich teaches, each master symbol includes at least one symbol segment corresponding respectively to the at least symbol field defined by the symbol template in col. 15, lines 8-45. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have each master symbol include a symbol segment corresponding to a symbol field defined by the symbol template and to combine Burakoff's master symbol with Zucknovich's each master symbol includes a symbol segment corresponding to a symbol field defined by the symbol template because such a modification in Burakoff would allow Burakoff 's system to have a field for at least one ticker symbol defined in a symbol template. Templates are well known in the art for the purpose of being a predesigned document that contains formatting and in many cases, generic text.

With respect to claim 7, Burakoff teaches, each master symbol refers to a security issued by a company in col. 7, lines 35-40. Zucknovich teaches, each master symbol refers to a security issued by a company in col.2, lines 55-61. Together Burakoff and Zucknovich teach the claim limitations of claim 7.

With respect to claim 8, Burakoff did not teach, the symbol template includes a root symbol field referring to the name of a security and a source symbol field referring to a country in which the security is traded. Zucknovich teaches, the symbol template includes a root symbol field referring to the name of a security and a source symbol field referring to a country in which the security is traded in col. 10, lines 33-65. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the symbol template include a root symbol field referring to the name of a security and a source symbol field referring to a country in which the security is traded and to combine Burakoff's process rules to the symbol with Zucknovich's the symbol template include a root symbol field referring to the name of a security and a source symbol field referring to a country in which the security is traded because such a modification in Burakoff would allow Burakoff 's system to have a primary field for the name of the security and another field for the country. The root is known in the art as being the main or uppermost level in a hierarchically organized set of information. The root is known as the point from which subsets (in this case source symbol fields) branch in a logical sequence that moves from a broader focus to narrower perspectives.

With respect to claim 9, Burakoff teaches, the step of storing at least one information element includes the steps of generating an information element identifier, storing the information element identifier and the parent identifier so that the parent identifier is linked to the information element identifier, and storing the information element and the information element identifier so that the information element identifier is linked to the information element in col. 3, lines 29-37 and lines 52-65, col. 4, lines 1-10, and col. 8, lines 43-47. Zucknovich teaches, the step of storing at least one information element includes the steps of generating an information element identifier, storing the information element identifier and the parent identifier so that the parent

identifier is linked to the information element identifier, and storing the information element and the information element identifier so that the information element identifier is linked to the information element in col.15, lines 31-45 and col. 22, lines 57-67. Together Burakoff and Zucknovich teach the claim limitations of claim 9.

With respect to claim 10, Burakoff teaches, each symbol segment comprises an ASCII (American Standard Code for Information Interchange) string in col. 9, lines 30-40. Zucknovich teaches, each symbol segment comprises an ASCII (American Standard Code for Information Interchange) string in col. 7, lines 16-25. Together Burakoff and Zucknovich teach the claim limitations of claim 10.

With respect to claim 11, Burakoff did not teach, the parent identifier is linked to the information element identifier in a relational database. Zucknovich teaches, the parent identifier is linked to the information element identifier in a relational database in col. 7, lines 5-15. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the parent identifier linked to the information element identifier in a relational database and to combine Burakoff's master symbol linked to the parent identifier with Zucknovich's parent identifier linked to the information element identifier in a relational database because such a modification in Burakoff would allow Burakoff 's system to have a relational database that allows field searching. Relational databases are well known in the database art as being a database that stores information in tables - rows and columns of data - and conducts searches using data in specified columns of one table to find additional data in another table. In a relational database, the rows of a table represent records (collections of information about separate items) and the columns represent fields (particular attributes of a record).

With respect to claim 16, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 5.

With respect to claim 17, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 6.

With respect to claim 18, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 7.

With respect to claim 19, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 8.

With respect to claim 20, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 9.

With respect to claim 21, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 10.

With respect to claim 22, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 11.

With respect to claim 30, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 16.

With respect to claim 31, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claims 16 and 30.

With respect to claim 32, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given for claim 17.

With respect to claim 33, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given for claim 18.

With respect to claim 34, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given for claim 19.

With respect to claim 35, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given for claim 21.

With respect to claim 36, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given for claim 22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 12, 13, 23-29, and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 6,122,635) Burakoff et al, hereafter Burakoff in view of (US 6,236,980 B1) Reese.

With respect to claim 12, Burakoff teaches, receiving an information element and at least an input symbol in col. 7, lines 5-15. Reese teaches, receiving an information element and at least an input symbol in col. 13, lines 34-55. Burakoff teaches, processing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol in col. 7, lines 35-45. Burakoff did not teach, searching a master symbol database using a normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier. Reese teaches, processing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol in col. 14, lines 22-34, searching a master symbol database using a normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier in col. 16, lines 20-34 and col. 17, lines 45-50. Burakoff teaches, storing at least the parent identifier and the information element so that the parent identifier is linked to the information element in col. 4, lines 52-65. Reese teaches, storing at least the parent identifier and the information element so that

the parent identifier is linked to the information element in col.17, lines 51-67 and col. 18, lines 1-4. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a normalized symbol and to use the normalized symbol to find the matching master symbol and to combine Burakoff's processing the symbol and storing a parent identifier with Reese's normalized symbol and using the normalized symbol to find the matching master symbol because such a modification in Burakoff would allow a user to enter the ticker symbol with the parent ID being the association found within the database.

With respect to claim 13, Burakoff teaches, processing the input symbol to generate the normalized symbol includes applying a set of character rules to the input symbol in col. col. 7, lines 41-50. Burakoff did not explicitly teach a normalized symbol. Reese teaches, a normalized symbol in col. 14, lines 22-34, col. 16, lines 20-34, and col. 17, lines 45-50. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a normalized symbol and to use the normalized symbol to find the matching master symbol and to combine Burakoff's processing the symbol and storing a parent identifier with Reese's normalized symbol and using the normalized symbol to find the matching master symbol because such a modification in Burakoff would allow a user to enter the ticker symbol with the parent ID being the association found within the database.

With respect to claim 23, Burakoff did not explicitly teach, if the normalized symbol contains an unresolved segment, searching a contributor database to find a predominant use segment and assigning the predominant use segment to the unresolved segment. Reese teaches, if the normalized symbol contains an unresolved segment, searching a contributor database to find a predominant use segment and assigning the predominant use segment to the unresolved segment in col. 26, lines 14-

24, fig. 10C(220) and col. 19, lines 3-17. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a normalized symbol contain an unresolved segment searching a contributor database to find a predominant use segment and to assign the predominant use segment to the unresolved segment and to combine Burakoff's input symbol and parent identifier with Reese's normalized symbol containing an unresolved segment, searching a contributor database to find a predominant use segment and assigning the predominant use segment to the unresolved segment because such a modification in Burakoff would allow a user to enter the ticker symbol with the parent ID being the association found within the database and to search for another symbol/abbreviation in the database.

With respect to claim 24, Burakoff did not teach, if the normalized symbol is not found in the master symbol database, searching a database using the input symbol and retrieving a parent identifier linked to the input symbol. Reese teaches, if the normalized symbol is not found in the master symbol database, searching a database using the input symbol and retrieving a parent identifier linked to the input symbol in col. 14, lines 22-34, col. 16, lines 20-34, col. 17, lines 45-50, and col. 39, lines 23-42. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a normalized symbol not found in the master symbol database to search a database using the input symbol and retrieving a parent identifier linked to the input symbol and to combine Burakoff's input symbol with Reese's normalized symbol not found in the master symbol database to search a database using the input symbol and retrieving a parent identifier linked to the input symbol because such a modification in Burakoff would allow Burakoff's system to enter a ticker symbol (an input symbol) and to use the association found within the database to search for the parent identifier symbol.

With respect to claim 25, Burakoff teaches, receiving an input symbol in col. 7, lines 51-57. Burakoff did not teach, processing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol and searching a master symbol database using the normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and a parent identifier linked to the master symbol. Reese teaches, processing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol and searching a master symbol database using the normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and a parent identifier linked to the master symbol in col. 14, lines 22-34, col. 16, lines 20-34, col. 17, lines 45-50. Burakoff teaches, searching an information element database to find an information element linked with the parent identifier and retrieving the information element linked to the parent identifier in col. 3, lines 29-30 and lines 39-45, col. 4, lines 15-19, and col. 10, lines 19-51. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a normalized symbol and to use the normalized symbol to find the matching master symbol and to combine Burakoff's processing the symbol and storing a parent identifier with Reese's normalized symbol and using the normalized symbol to find the matching master symbol because such a modification in Burakoff would allow a user to enter the ticker symbol with the parent ID being the association found within the database. This claim is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 12.

With respect to claim 26, Burakoff did not teach, determining whether the input symbol includes an unresolved segment and if the input symbol contains an unresolved segment, searching a client database to find a client preference segment, and assigning the client preference segment to the unresolved segment. Reese teaches, determining whether the input symbol includes an unresolved segment and if the input symbol contains an unresolved segment, searching a client database to find a client preference

segment, and assigning the client preference segment to the unresolved segment in col. 19, lines 3-17 and col. 26, lines 14-24. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine whether the input symbol includes an unresolved segment and if the input symbol contains an unresolved segment, searching a client database to find a client preference segment, and assigning the client preference segment to the unresolved segment and to combine Burakoff's receiving an input symbol and searching a database with Reese's determining whether the input symbol includes an unresolved segment and if the input symbol contains an unresolved segment, searching a client database to find a client preference segment, and assigning the client preference segment to the unresolved segment because such a modification in Burakoff would allow a user to enter the ticker symbol (an input symbol) and to find an association within the database to find the user's preferred symbol. This claim is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 25.

With respect to claim 27, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 13.

With respect to claim 28, Burakoff teaches, processing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol comprises applying a set of process rules in col. 3, lines 2-13.

This dependent claim is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 13.

With respect to claim 29, Burakoff teaches, the information element is a document.

With respect to claim 37, Burakoff teaches, a storage device in col. 5, 36-39, a network interface in col. 5, lines 40-42, a processor in col. 5, lines 29-30 coupled to the storage device in col. 5, lines 36-39, the processor adapted to: store a database of

master symbols, wherein each master symbol is linked to a parent identifier and a document database in col. 6, lines 10-13.

This independent claim is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claims 12 and 25.

With respect to claim 38, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claims 23 and 26.

With respect to claim 39, Burakoff teaches, a storage device in col. 5, lines 36-39 storing a master symbol database and a document database in col. 6, lines 10-13, the master symbol database storing master symbols, wherein each master symbol is linked to a parent identifier in col. 4, lines 20-23, and the document database storing documents linked to a parent identifier; a network interface in col. 5, lines 40-42, a processor in col. 5, lines 29-30, which: receives an input symbol via the network interface in col. 7, lines 51-67, Reese teaches, processes the input symbol to obtain a normalized input symbol in col. 14, lines 22-34 and searches the symbol database using the normalized input symbol to find a matching master symbol and a linked parent identifier in col. 16, lines 20-34 and col. 17, lines 45-50. Burakoff teaches, retrieves documents from the document database that are linked to the parent identifier in col. 4, lines 52-65 and col. 6, lines 10-13. This independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 37.

With respect to claim 40, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given for claims 26 and 38.

With respect to claim 41, Burakoff teaches, receiving a plurality of input symbols, each pertaining to a same single entity (col. 7, lines 29-40); and for each of the plurality of input symbols, generating a normalized master symbol (col. 7, lines 61-67).

Burakoff did not teach, storing the parent symbol and the plurality of master symbols in a master symbol database wherein each of the plurality of normalized master symbols is linked to the parent symbol, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the parent symbol and the plurality of master symbols in a master symbol database wherein each of the plurality of normalized master symbols is linked to the parent symbol and to modify in Burakoff because such a modification would allow Burakoff to have a main symbol for searching and connecting to in the database. A database by definition is a file composed of records, each containing fields together with as of operations for searching, sorting, recombining, and other functions.

With respect to claim 42, Burakoff teaches, a processor (col. 5, lines 29-30), wherein the processor is adapted to: receive a plurality of input symbols, each pertaining to a same single entity (col. 4, lines 20-24) for each of the plurality of input symbols, generate a normalized master symbol (col. 7, lines 61-67) determine a unique parent symbol corresponding to the master symbols (col. 8, lines 42-58).

This claim is also rejected for the similar rationale as claim 41.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 06/12/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1. Applicants' argue: Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, matching a central index key to any of an internal identification number, a CUSIP number of a stock exchange ticker symbol and determining if the identification number, CUSIP number or stock exchange ticker symbol relates to a particular security is not processing a symbol to generate a master symbol and Burakoff does not describe processing a symbol to generate a master symbol or teach or suggest storing both a master symbol and a parent identifier as recited in claim 1 has been considered but is not persuasive because the Examiner interprets Burakoff's processing a symbol to generate a master symbol in col. 7, lines 35-40 and storing both a master symbol and a parent identifier in col. 3, lines 29-34 and col. 4, lines 20-23. It is well known in the art that a stock ticker symbol (master symbol) is a symbol assigned by a stock exchange to identify a security (a unique identify).

2. Applicants' argue: Zucknovich does not cure any of the deficiencies discussed relating to claim 1 has been considered but is not persuasive because claim 16 does not recite "processing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol or searching a master symbol database using a normalized symbol to find a matching symbol and linked parent identifier". Claim 16 recites "... master symbol database stores a set of master symbols, wherein each master symbol is structured according to a symbol template containing at least one symbol field." Therefore, this argument is considered "moot."

3. Applicants' argue: Reese does not teach the step of processing an input symbol to generate a normalized symbol has been considered but is not persuasive because the Examiner interprets Reese as teaching the step of processing an input

symbol to generate a normalized symbol in col. 14, lines 22-34 (the input symbol is WDC and the generated normalized symbol is Western Digital (WDC)). It is unclear to the Examiner what Applicants' "normalized symbol" means from reading Applicants' Specification. While applicants' may be their own lexicographer, the Examiner must be able to understand from reading Applicants' Specification what Applicants' mean by "normalized symbol" in the claim language. The Examiner has given this element the broadest reasonable interpretation in light of Applicants' Specification. "Normalize" by definition means to make conform to or reduce to a norm or standard or to bring or restore to a normal condition.

Inquires

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 703-308-7064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 am -5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1038. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for Official communications and 703-746-5622 for Non-Official communications.

Art Unit: 3624

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.



E. Colbert

November 27, 2002